

REMARKS


The Title is amended again above, because the Amendment After Allowance was not entered. However, it is understood that the Examiner's Amendment approved by telephone August 29, 2002, to make claims 47 and 48 depend from claims 46 and 47 has been entered.

The non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is traversed by a concurrently filed Terminal Disclaimer.

The rejection of claim 44 under 35 USC 102 for anticipation by the cited Rudolf patent is traversed by adding a new limitation to claim 44 to "an excitation element for oscillating the oscillator." The excitation element is first described at page 6, line 3, of the original specification. The excitation element distinguishes the claim from the Rudolf patent, because the patent only discloses an acceleration sensor that does not include means for excited oscillations like the velocity sensor claimed.

Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, requested.

Respectfully submitted,



William R. Evans
c/o Ladas & Parry
26 West 61st Street
New York, New York
Reg. No. 25858
Tel. No. (212) 708-1930